

## **REMARKS**

Claims 22-24 and 26-28 are pending in the application. Claims 22-24 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-21 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 27 and 28 are newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,417,844 to Kodama, hereafter Kodama in view of U.S Patent No. 4,430,526 to Brown et al., hereafter Brown. This rejection is moot as to claims 1-9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19-21 and 25, which have been canceled.

The present patent application describes a computing system in which a flip pen device controls a digitizer tablet that has a memory and is connected to a computer. One end of the pen is used for inking information that is stored inside the tablet's memory (and the computer can be off), and the other end of the pen is used to control the computer (for example to operate as a mouse function).

Claim 22 has been amended to clarify that the computing system includes an input device, a computing device and a detector, the input device including a memory, a controller having a first CPU and an electronic pen device and the computing device including a second CPU. Amended claim 22 has also been amended to recite that the controller is interfaced with the detector so that the "first CPU selectively interprets the emitted signals as one of information to be stored by said input device and information to be forwarded to said computing device and that routes (a) to said memory the information to be stored therein and (b) to the computing device the information to be forwarded thereto for processing by said second CPU." Support for this amendment is found in Figs. 1-3 and accompanying description.

Neither Kodama nor Brown teaches an input device with a CPU and a computing device with a CPU, in which signals emitted by the flip pen device of the input device are interpreted by the input device's CPU to route information to one of the input device's memory or to the computing device's CPU. When the information is routed to the memory of the input device, the computing device can go to sleep (and save power). When the information is routed to the computing device, the second CPU can use the information, for example, to control the second computer's function, for example, an image on a display of the second computer.

The claimed dual processing system differs from Kodama and Brown, which describe single integrated computing systems. From a user perspective, an advantage is that while the user is writing with a first tip, the PC (computing device) can sleep in a very low power state and thereby save battery life. When the user switches to the second tip, the processor (first CPU) in the tablet sends the information to the PC (computing device) as control information (for example for mouse positioning). The Kodama/Brown combination does not have an input device including a controller that is interfaced with the detector and that selectively interprets the emitted signal as one of information to be stored in a memory of the input device and information to be forwarded to the computing device.

To reiterate, in the claimed computing system the input device's detector (the tablet system) can capture the user's handwriting to local memory while the computing device is in a low power state. When the pen is flipped, the computing device enters a high power state and the user can control functions on the computing device (for example positioning the mouse). The combination of Kodama and Brown would not achieve this functionality because each teaches a single device that is used for interaction. Amended claim 22 recites a dual system that provides a unique and non-obvious, function, namely, a very low

power system with limited interaction when writing with the first tip, and a very interactive high power system when controlling the computing device with the second tip. As neither Kodama nor Brown taken separately or in combination, teaches the claimed dual system, it is submitted that amended claim 22 is patentably distinct therefrom and, therefore, is allowable.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 22-24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Kodama in view of Brown as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,441,810 to Skoog et al., hereafter Skoog. This rejection is moot, since claims 10 and 11 have been canceled.

The Office Action rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Kodama in view of Brown as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,415,240 to Kobayashi, hereafter Kobayashi. This rejection is moot, since claims 14 and 15 have been canceled.

The Office Action rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Kodama in view of Brown as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S Patent No. 5,963,199 to Kato et al., hereafter Kato. This rejection is moot, since claim 18 has been canceled.

Newly presented claims 27 and 28 recite that the second CPU responds to the information forwarded thereto to control a display or function of the second computing device. Support for claim 22 is found at page 6, lines 24-27, page 7, lines 14-17 and line 30 to page 8, line 2, and page 9, lines 20 and 21. Newly presented claims 27 and 28 are allowable for the same reasons set forth above for independent claim 22.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 22-24 and 26-28 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8-18-04

Robert R. Hubbard

Robert R. Hubbard  
Reg. No. 22,438  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
(203) 327-4500